REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner considered claims 1-15 as originally filed in this application. Applicant's Response to Office Action filed on February 25, 2003 ("the 2003 Response") included an amendment to claims 1, 6, and 14, and the addition of new claims 16-92. For the Examiner's convenience, the claims filed in the 2003 Response are listed above and presented under current amendment practice. The claims have not been amended since the 2003 Response. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to consider all of the above-listed claims.

The Examiner rejected original claims 1-15 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,508,789 ("'789 patent"). Applicant respectfully submits that the double-patenting rejection is premature as it is directed against claims 1-15 as originally filed, and not against the claims as amended by the 2003 Response (e.g., amended claims 1, 6, and 14, and new claims 16-92). Even if the double patenting rejection were not premature, Applicant would traverse the rejection. The Examiner contends that the claims of the '789 "anticipate" the pending claims. (See Office Action, page 2, par. 4). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention at least for the reason that independent claim 1 of the present application recites an "information processing apparatus" including "an input device that allows said user to select said second set of displayable data." Neither one of independent claims 1 and 20 of the '789 patent recites this element. Accordingly, Applicant submits that even if the double patenting rejection were timely made, the claims of the present invention are patentably distinct from those of the '789 patent.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims, as currently pending, are patentable. Therefore, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding rejection in view of the preceding comments. Issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance of the claims is earnestly solicited.

To the extent any extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required to obtain

entry of this reply, such extension is hereby respectfully requested. If there are any fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 which are not enclosed herewith, including any fees required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1068.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTIN & FERRARO, LLP

Dated: February 3, 2010

By: _____
Amedeo F. Ferraro
Registration No. 37,129

1557 Lake O'Pines Street, NE
Hartville, Ohio 44632
Telephone: (310) 286-9800
Facsimile: (310) 286-2795